



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,230	04/24/2001	Stuart Gerald Stubblebine	2455-4230US3	5050

7590 12/11/2003

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154

EXAMINER

AKPATI, ODAICHE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	8

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/840,230	STUBBLEBINE, STUART GERALD
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tracey Akpati	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) ____ is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 52-56 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Abadi et al.

The limitation “means for preparing a statement of an assigned revocation authority in a distributed system network in response to a policy, said revocation authority statement being associated with an initial statement; means for preparing a statement of a freshness constraint period in the distributed system network in response to said policy, said freshness statement being associated with said revocation authority statement; means for preparing a validity statement at said assigned revocation authority in the distributed system network in response to said policy, said validity statement including a verification status at some temporal reference; means for providing said revocation authority statement, said freshness statement, and said validity statement to a verification authority in the distributed system network; and means for selectively verifying said initial statement at said verification authority in response to said initial statement, said revocation authority statement, said freshness statement, and said validity statement” is met by Abadi on page 204, columns 1 and 2, page 205, section 2.3 continued.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abadi et al in view of Denning et al.

With respect to Claim 52,

Abadi et al teaches:

“deriving freshness constraints from initial policy assumptions and an authentic statement” (see page 201, column 2, first paragraph).

“imposing freshness constraints by employing recent-secure authenticating principals to effect revocation” (see page 201, column 2, first paragraph).

Abadi et al however does not explicitly teach the expression of $|t_{now} - t_{timestamp}| < \delta$. Denning however shows this.

Denning et al teaches “verifying that a relation $|t_{now} - t_{timestamp}| < \delta$ is satisfied for verification of a secure channel, where $t_{timestamp}$ being a time of a time stamp pertaining to a validity assertion of a particular assertion, δ being a minimum necessary freshness constraint pertaining to the

Art Unit: 2131

particular assertion and t_{now} being the time of verification" (see page 534, column 2, lines 1-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Denning et al within the system of Abadi et al because as Denning et al states in the cited section, this protocol protects against replay attacks.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to employ the teachings of Denning et al within the system of Abadi et al to obtain the claimed invention.

With respect to Claim 53,

Abadi et al teaches:

"means for asserting a time stamped validity assertion pertaining to the validity of an initial assertion" on page 202, second paragraph, 5th sentence.

"means for asserting freshness constraints indicating a length of time and the initial assertions that the freshness constraints relate to" on page 204, lines 1-21, column 1.

Abadi et al however does not explicitly teach the expression of $|t_{now} - t_{timestamp}| < \delta$. Denning however shows this.

Denning et al teaches "means for verifying that a relation $|t_{now} - t_{timestamp}| < \delta$ is satisfied for each particular assertion necessary for verification of a secure channel, where $t_{timestamp}$ is a time of a

Art Unit: 2131

time stamp pertaining to the validity assertion of a particular assertion, δ being a minimum necessary freshness constraint pertaining to the particular assertion and t_{now} being the time of verification" on page 534, column 2, lines 1-16.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Denning et al within the system of Abadi et al because as Denning et al states in the cited section, this protocol protects against replay attacks.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to employ the teachings of Denning et al within the system of Abadi et al to obtain the claimed invention.

With respect to Claim 54,

Abadi et al teaches:

"means for issuing an authoritative assertion by a distinguished principal; means for asserting freshness constraints on the assertion; means for asserting a time stamped validity assertion to the assertion indicating the validity of the assertion at the time of the time stamp" on page 201, column 2.

Abadi et al however does not explicitly teach the expression of $|t_{now} - t_{timestamp}| < \delta$. Denning however shows this.

Art Unit: 2131

Denning et al teaches “means for verifying that a relation $|t_{now} - t_{timestamp}| < \delta$ is satisfied for each particular assertion necessary for verification of a secure channel, where $t_{timestamp}$ being the time of a time stamp pertaining to the validity assertion of the particular assertion, δ being the minimum necessary freshness constraint pertaining to the particular assertion, and t_{now} being the time of verification” on page 534, column 2, lines 1-16.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Denning et al within the system of Abadi et al because as Denning et al states in the cited section, this protocol protects against replay attacks.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to employ the teachings of Denning et al within the system of Abadi et al to obtain the claimed invention.

Claim 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Oorschot et al (5699431) in view of Denning et al.

Van Oorschot et al teaches:

“means for issuing certificates for principals within an organization by the organization; means for asserting, by the organization, a principal authorized as an authority for issuing time stamped certificates; means for delegating authority for

Art Unit: 2131

issuing time stamped certificates; means for asserting freshness constraints on assertions" on column 1, lines 30-67 and column 2, lines 1-9.

Van Oorschot et al however does not explicitly teach the expression of $|t_{now} - t_{timestamp}| < \delta$.

Denning however shows this.

Denning et al teaches "means for verifying that a relation $|t_{now} - t_{timestamp}| < \delta$ is satisfied for each particular assertion necessary for verification of a secure channel, where $t_{timestamp}$ being a time of a time stamp pertaining to the validity assertion of a particular assertion, δ being a minimum necessary freshness constraint pertaining to the particular assertion and t_{now} being the time of verification" on page 534, column 2, lines 1-16.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Denning et al within the system of Van Oorschot et al because as Denning et al states in the cited section, this protocol protects against replay attacks.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to employ the teachings of Denning et al within the system of Van Oorschot et al to obtain the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tracey Akpati whose telephone number is 703-305-7820. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30am-6.00pm.

Art Unit: 2131

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7240 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

November 20, 2003